FELLOWSHIP

December, 1945 — Vol. XI—No. 12

CHRISTMAS EVE

NOW I lay me down to sleep;
I pray thee, Lord, the souls to keep,
Of other children, far away,
Who have no homes in which to stay,
Nor know where is their daily bread
Nor where at night to lay their head,
But wander through a broken land,
Alone and helpless—
Take their hand.

—Author Unknown

Pearl Harbor and the War Power
By OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

•

They Can Greet As Brothers
By FERNER NUHN

•

Religious Life in Germany
By F. SIEGMUND-SCHULTZE

•

Conscience Against the Atomic Bomb
By A. J. MUSTE

•

The Joy of the Lord
By PHILIPPE VERNIER

15 cents a copy — $1.50 a Year

FROM MY STANDPOINT

John Haynes Holmes

WHY did World War II produce no pacifist literature to compare with that produced by World War I? The tide of war books in this latest war was immense, and on the whole of a much better quality than the war books of 1914-18. But pacifist books were few; and none of them, so far as I can recall, was memorable.

I

Think of such a book, for example, as Romaine Rolland's *Above the Battle*. In World War I, this book kindled a fire in human hearts the world around, and lit the way for countless feet in the enveloping darkness of the times. Its noblest passages —"Humanity is a symphony of great collective souls," "For the finer spirits of Europe there are two dwelling places," "Come friends, let us make a stand!"—these have become a part of the sacred scriptures of the race. Its message endures as though written yesterday. Why has this later war brought forth no such masterpiece of the spirit?

Then, there was *Justice in War Time,* by Bertrand Russell—a collection of essays, of which "An Appeal to the Intellectuals of Europe" was a fair companion-piece to Rolland's work. This opening essay was followed by "The Ethics of War," "War and Non-Resistance," "Why Nations Love War," and other drastic pieces. Russell could not write such a book today, as he has changed his ideas. In 1914-18, he went to prison; in 1939-45, he went to war. But it would seem as though some other might have taken up his pen in this second conflict. But none did!

Who can forget Randolph Bourne's *The War and the Intellectuals,* published in 1917? It was in that year, when America followed Wilson into war as later it followed Roosevelt, that the intellectuals of this country began that process of betrayal which has continued into the shame and ignominy of the present hour. Bourne sounded the warning of what war does to mind and character—and to freedom! He foresaw and foretold what has happened to the culture and enlightenment of this age. Perhaps he spoke his word so well that it did not have to be spoken again. In any case, there have been few and feeble echoes of his heroic utterance.

Great anti-war novels were a notable feature of the first World War. Chief among these was Henri Barbusse's *Under Fire*—a veritable epic of hatred and denunciation. Rolland's *Clerambault* was more of a pacifist tract than a story, but a glorious piece of writing all the same. Then there was Georges Duhamel's *Civilization,* and Andreas Latzko's *Men in War.* To these I would add H. G. Wells's *Mr. Britling Sees It Through,* which in its unforgettable closing chapters was a sheer plea for the peace that can come only from mutual understanding, compassion, and forgiveness on both sides of the battlefront. Where are novels of this description today?

Most astonishing of all is the absence of poetry in our time. Think of the poets who sang their brave, pitiful, and anguished songs during the First World War! So many and so remarkable were these poets, especially in England, that 1914-18 stands out as a distinctive literary period of modern times. None of them all hated war so terribly, and penetrated with such insight into its ghastly realities, as Siegfried Sassoon and Wilfred Owen. These sensitive young men felt the full horror of arms and understood the deadly work of arms, and, supremely gifted with poetic tongues, poured forth the outrage of their souls. Where are such poets today? An Edith Lovejoy Pierce—but who other?

II

To describe this phenomenon is far easier than to explain it. One fact, however, is obvious, and that is that war was something new to the world of 1914. Its coming was a shock to minds totally unprepared for what occurred. It seemed incredible that the world could thus drop apart—that men, hitherto friendly, could rend and tear like animals—that destruction and massacre could be let loose upon modern society. As the horror deepened and widened, the souls of men revolted. They could not endure this agony. So they cried aloud in pity for mankind, in protest against bitterness and hatred and enmity, in anguish over the ills of war, in warning against the impending doom of civilization. Prophets, poets, intellectuals generally, spoke out—and the result was a literature of heroic proportions.

But things now have changed. War has been with us for more than thirty years, and has become a part of the order of things. Men are not surprised any more at what is happening; few are shocked, fewer still are horrified. Once sensitive, they have become insensitive to wrong. Once idealistic, they have become disillusioned, and even cynical. Gradually men have sunk into a kind of lethargy of despair—and such despair is dumb. The great silence that has come over men's souls is perhaps the surest measure of the tragedy of this age. Does it not mean that humanity is dying within as well as without?

If so, the task for us pacifists is plain. It is to make sure, in the first place, that we ourselves are living and not dead. Is there no danger of spiritual paralysis seizing upon our hearts? If we are not speaking as we did in the last war, is it not because we no longer have the will, the buoyant faith, the exultant courage we once had? Shall we not cry with Walter Scott, in the darkest hour of his life, "Exertion, exertion! O invention, rouse thyself," that we may not fail the challenge of these times!

Secondly, we must convey to others the life we quicken within ourselves. Keep alive the ideals of the soul, resurrect the dead hopes of other days, restore and rededicate the spirit which is of God! If the world is lost in darkness, it is because a light has failed. If men perish of disillusionment and despair, it is because fountains of living water have ceased to flow. What is pacifism but the affirmation of truth when men deny? By voice and pen, in song and story, in poetry, prophecy, and parable, let the heart speak, and a new literature will appear among us!

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the
Fellowship of Reconciliation
2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, A. J. MUSTE } *Editors*

J. ELLIOTT FINLAY
Managing Editor

RUTH ERWIN
Assistant Editor

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Vera Brittain
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Eugene Exman
Caleb Foote
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Erna Harris
John Haynes Holmes
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Elmore M. McKee
Ferner Nuhn
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Edwin McNeill Poteat
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly. Reentered as second class matter February 15, 1941, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., and at the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

15 Cents a Copy $1.50 a Year

FELLOWSHIP

THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

December 1945 **Vol. XI—No. 12**

Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt, and the War Power

By OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD*

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE have a profound stake in the Pearl Harbor inquiry which goes far beyond the question of the conduct and professional efficiency of our Army and Navy commanders when the Japanese struck. This inquiry was voted by Congress, in response to public sentiment, within a couple of weeks after President Truman, on releasing the final Army and Navy reports of the terrible events of December 7, said he hoped that the whole business could now be dropped. But still the importance of the inquisition is only faintly understood.

If the inquiry really goes to the roots of that disaster in a non-partisan spirit—as Senator Barkley has promised that it would—bent only upon obtaining the truth and without sparing anybody involved, whether alive or dead, the government itself and Franklin Roosevelt will be on trial and great light will be thrown upon our whole governmental system. It should tell us exactly how the country was put into the war and illustrate how completely the war-making power has slipped from the Congress into the hands of the Chief Executive, in contravention of the Constitutional requirement that the Congress alone shall have the power to declare war.

We shall see how determined President Roosevelt was to get us into the war, despite his pre-election pledge to American parents that he would never send their sons into a foreign war—subsequently amended to read "unless we are attacked." It was on October 30, 1940, that Franklin Roosevelt made this solemn promise to the American people. On April 9, 1941, the advance guard of an American army of 80,000 men was landed in Iceland, and the knowledge of this entrance into the Second World War was withheld from the American people by a voluntary censorship adopted by the press. Of this the dailies are very proud. It was, however, an absolute betrayal of the most sacred trust of the newspapers, namely, to keep the American people informed of what their government is about. Thus, in September, 1941, *three months before Pearl Harbor* and the German declaration of war, we destroyed a German meteorological station in Greenland, killing or capturing its members. If this was not war, what was it but an act of piracy? Yet not a word of this appeared in any daily.

But as we approach Pearl Harbor even more sensational facts appear. It is now known that the British "cracked" one Japanese code in the fall of 1941, and our Navy another one a little later. In this way the President learned authoritatively by November 5, that Tokyo would compromise no further, and that any agreement for peace must be signed by November 25. On the 28th, Secretary Hull notified Ambassador Halifax that the situation was completely out of their hands and in those of the Army and Navy—notification that war was near. This was nine days before the attack, yet our two commanders in Hawaii were no more allowed to know this terrible fact than were the American press and people. Mr. Hull thereafter pretended, just as much as the two Japanese ambassadors, to be working for peace when he knew that war was at hand. Yet from November 27 on, not a communication as to our relations with Japan was sent to General Short. Moreover, it is now alleged that the President, Mr. Hull, Mr. Knox, and Mr. Stimson knew on the evening of December 6 that an immediate Japanese attack was pending, this because of another intercepted dispatch. Still no warning was sent to Hawaii. When the news was finally dispatched to General Short it was by slow commercial telegram, although General Marshall had on his desk a "scrambler phone" by which he could have reached General Short immediately.

Yet the whole responsibility for the tragedy was shifted to the shoulders of the two commanders who had thus been ignored. The commission headed by Justice Roberts of the Supreme Court, which made a superficial investigation of the tragedy, pronounced them guilty and recommended their being court-martialled. Even this was denied them on the ground that it could not be done in wartime, and to this hour these unfortunate men have never had their day in court. One of our most distinguished historians, who has made a special study of Pearl Harbor, tells his friends that he considers it worse than the Dreyfus case, except that these officers were not condemned to penal servitude.

But even the plight of these officers, grievous as it is,

* Former editor and publisher of *The New York Post* and *The Nation*. Author of hundreds of articles in leading magazines.

is of minor importance compared with the fact that—as Pearl Harbor demonstrates anew—the President of the United States, through his control of the diplomatic service and the Army and Navy, can put this country into war at any time he pleases. This is not the first time that it has happened. The Mexican War, which President Grant stated in his memoirs was the worst case of aggression against a weak power by a large one of which he had ever read (he served in it as a lieutenant and captain) was brought about by the Southern intention to take over Texas, and by President Polk's sending the American Army onto Mexican soil. This was so clearly an act of aggression that if he were alive today he would certainly be eligible for trial by the military court now sitting in Nuremburg.

Again, President McKinley put this country into war in 1898 after our Minister to Spain, General Stewart L. Woodford, had achieved a magnificent diplomatic victory and Spain had yielded on every point except three or four minor ones, even giving us the right to send relief ships to the starving Cubans at once. So we actually waged a war with an enemy which had yielded at every important point before the first shot was fired! I think this is unparalleled in history. Every man who died in our war with Spain was slain by this decision of McKinley's, which James Ford Rhoades says, in his history of the McKinley and Roosevelt Administrations, can only be laid to the fact that McKinley did it for purely political purposes in order to strengthen the Republican Party.

It would be possible to go on and take such cases as our attacks upon the Haitian and Nicaraguan Governments to show how often this country has gone to war by the simple act of the President. Nobody in Haiti had ever hurt an American; the government had never quarreled with ours. But someone told President Wilson that the Germans were planning to have a submarine base on the island, and so he gave the fleet orders to move in. In the first year of that war alone, the Marine Corps killed 5,000 Haitians, men, women, and children. The responsibility for these deaths rests squarely upon Woodrow Wilson alone. Yet the average American is startled when his attention is called to the fact that any President can at any time put this country into war on his own notion. As we look back, it is certainly not surprising to recall that President Roosevelt and Henry L. Stimson did their utmost to defeat the Ludlow resolution for a referendum of the American people as to whether we should or should not make war. They wanted to be in a position to put us into any conflict—quietly and without our knowledge, as happened after the President's solemn Boston promise. And today many Americans uphold Mr. Roosevelt on the ground that "we *had* to get into the war," that the President was justified in "taking the lead behind the scenes" because the people were not prepared to go in and so had to be led or maneuvered into it. Such reasoning does not justify his secrecy, deceit, and his violation of the Constitution.

Future Safeguards

Now how can the American people guard themselves against such betrayal by their presidents? What can be done to prevent another president from ensnaring them to the point where war with, let us say Russia, is unavoidable? These questions are extremely difficult to answer and not only because of the enormous increase in the powers of the Chief Executive, both as head of the Army and Navy and as director of our diplomatic service. Some of them are innate in the development of our machine age and the massed aggregations of capital in international business, etc. As the case of Mr. Roosevelt shows, behind the screen of diplomatic and military secrets, plans can be made which cannot be detected because of that secrecy and the ability of President and State Department to delay for years the publication of vital exchanges of letters and also important documents. Incidentally, a bill, *already passed by the Senate,* makes it a crime for any individual to publish any government document which was sent in code—probably an effort to prevent the publication of the coming Tyler Kent revelations as to pre-war relations and plans of Roosevelt and Churchill. Franklin Roosevelt scored Woodrow Wilson's plea for "open covenants openly arrived at." At Cairo, Teheran, and Yalta, with two other men he secretly parcelled out the dying Europe, and not until after his death were the people and press allowed to know some of the dreadful bargains he consented to, like the division of Poland and Korea, and Russia's entry into the Japanese war, the price for which we do not yet know. Indeed, there is still doubt if we know all the bargains to which we are committed, and which Mr. Truman is mistakenly recognizing.

Official circles will oppose any restriction of the President's powers, claiming that the people cannot be safely informed of government secrets and negotiations or of Army and Navy plans when danger of war exists; claims will be made that "the President must have the right to deal secretly if he considers that a national necessity for it has arisen." These are false arguments. They are the stock in trade of those in high office—trickery to reserve their power to themselves, to retain their complete control of our destinies. Against them everyone who believes in Christianity, in human decency, and in peace must fight unceasingly, for in the background lies an atom bomb a hundred or a thousand times more destructive than those dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

As for concrete remedies, here are some:

1. A joint commission of Congress on foreign affairs to be fully posted at all times and in regular touch with the President.

2. The seating of the Cabinet on the Senate floor for a regular question hour, like that in the House of Commons, with a refusal to permit evasion on the ground of secrecy.

3. Stated, regular debates in both Houses on foreign affairs.

4. Control of army and navy policy by a civilian advisory committee with Congressional membership, such as is advised now by Hanson Baldwin for the reconstitution of army and navy and the fixing of our future military and naval policies.

5. The presence of representatives of the press at all international sessions and governmental gatherings to discuss foreign, military and naval affairs. Any disadvantages arising from this would be more than offset by compelling diplomats and statesmen to be frank, open and aboveboard.

6. A referendum on war and the introduction of national referenda, so that at any time the public may have the opportunity to vote on national policies, such as the taking over of insular possessions, entanglements in the Near East over oil concessions, etc. This is the only truly democratic procedure, for the basis of our democracy is faith in the combined wisdom of the American people.

7. International world organization in which all States shall be on an equal footing and none be given a special position because of their power and military might.

It is true that there will be dangers involved in a centralized world power and in placing the fate of nations in a few hands, but some chances will have to be taken in pioneering along such an unprecedented line. Above all, we must realize here at home that governments today, with their armies and navies wherever they are, are the enemies of peace and at bottom the enemies of the people, precisely as the Tolstoyans and the Mennonites have pointed out for so long. Yet we cannot live without governments; the weakness of the Russian philosophical anarchists of the type of Tolstoy and Kropotkin was that they had no suggestions to offer as to what to substitute for governments, whose invasion and control of the private lives and fates of citizens have grown enormously since their day. For this hour, our answer is to insist upon the abolition of all secrecy in the handling of international affairs.

They Can Greet As Brothers

By FERNER NUHN*

COMBAT SOLDIERS AND AVOWED PACIFISTS make up the two groups that modern war sets apart in a peculiar way from the main body of society. Each feels the impact of war in ways that the bulk of society does not feel it.

There are many differences between the groups. The soldier group is very large, the pacifist group very small. The combat soldier faces grave physical peril and hardship; the pacifist (though this does not hold for the medical corpsmen) may go through the war in relative physical safety. The soldier has the blessing and energetic support of the civilian population; the conscientious objector has its grudging tolerance or open antagonism.

But there is much in common between these two groups. Psychologically, both groups feel strongly their set-apartness from the main body of their society. War has taken them both up, out of their normal lives, and set them in strange and undesired positions. Both groups know experiences and feelings which they find very hard to communicate to their friends, relatives, and fellow citizens who have not gone through them. War has made lonely men of them both.

The combat soldier is forced by his society to face two things which the rest of society turns away from, or meets only at a distance. These are, first, the chance of being killed or gravely injured; and second, the necessity of killing other human beings, and of seeing them killed all about him, friend and enemy alike. Either of these things alone is a terrible psychological fact for a human being to have to face. This is the peculiar burden which society lays on the combat soldier.

The pacifist, while he does not face these terrible necessities, is forced to face others which are psychologically comparable. First, he must openly follow a principle that his society does not accept. Secondly, he must be separated from the main labor and concern of his society in a time of grave physical danger. Thousands of young men, when offered a choice, find the conditions of the combat soldier easier to accept.

The crux of the matter for the combat soldier is his necessity of facing deliberately both the possibility of his own death and the necessity of killing. Somewhere between his induction or enlistment and his forwarding up to the combat area, he begins to feel the implications of these things. The terrible finality of the military process closes about him. With little or no choice on his part, he has been caught up by this machine of war, and required to give all his powers and perhaps his life to fighting a remote but deadly conflict.

He musters such reasons as he can believe in for taking up the task that has been given him: that his country has been attacked or is in danger; that the war has hopeful aims for the world in general; that the enemy, in any case, must be licked; that the job must be done; or simply that since he is in it, he wants to get the thing over, stay alive if he can, and return to his own life. He is fortunate if he can find idealistic reasons that convince and inspire him. The willingness to assume a dangerous task for the sake of one's society remains one of the highest of human motives.

But the fighting of a modern war tends to leave less and less place for idealism in the motivation of the soldier. A man who has been conscripted by force of law, and chosen chiefly for physical fitness, who has not been consulted about his views on the war, and who is now asked to keep his personal views to himself, finds it hard to retain high motives for fighting. The ideas and politics of the war, he comes to see, are in other hands. His job is only to fight the war, not to determine its purposes.

One compensation, however, the combat soldier has. He has the support of his society. He gets the best food and clothing and equipment that his society can produce. The folks back home feel guilty about the soldier's great personal sacrifice and their own easier situation, and they send him candy and cigarettes and entertainers and Red Cross workers and chaplains. They try in every way they can to make it up to him, with prayers, speeches, citations, honors, bonuses, rewards, and memorials. For what it may be worth, the combat soldier is the hero of the day.

It is just the opposite with the pacifist. He is one of the villains of the day—or at least an embarrassing problem. For he stubbornly continues to hold to what almost everyone would like to believe and still hopes may sometime be true: namely, that men should not kill each other, but live in peace together. This view is now an encumbrance to the supreme work of the nation. So society in wartime may grudgingly tolerate the conscientious objector, but will make it very uncomfortable for him to hold to his position.

The crux of the matter for the objector is this break with his own society. At some point he must go his separate way, or he cannot rightfully be called a pacifist. The definite break is what costs the struggle and gives whatever merit there may be to the position. His whole case rests on his ability to fit principle and act together.

If a conscientious objector is not open to conscription for combat duty, he may simply remain in his home community, and meet only the difficulty of separating him-

* Author of *The Wind Blew East.*

self from its wartime activities. Yet it is hard to make such a break with friends and neighbors.

The pacifist of combat age faces added complications. His courage, manliness, and patriotism are continually open to question, in the view of most of his fellow citizens. Psychologically, this is the hardest kind of burden for a young man to carry during a time of physical peril—a young man who himself has not yet had the chance to prove his mettle in the world. Fear of being misunderstood on this score sends thousands of young men into military service whose instincts are the other way.

Whatever the situation he finds himself in, the sincere objector to the use of force has one compensation intrinsic with his stand. He has determined his position on conscientious grounds. This fact constitutes his main social contribution over the long run and his own inner support during the ordeal of the war period.

The combat soldier is not less sensitive by nature than the rest of the population. He is chosen only as the most physically fit. His society must take him from his normal development as a civilian and toughen him for his peculiar role. He must learn a new set of human responses —hostile and callous rather than friendly and sympathetic.

Even so, many thousands of men of modern nations are unable, with the best intentions, to become good combat material. Those who fail are often among the more able and intelligent. The increasing number of "psychological casualties" is only another evidence of the deep inner conflict which war is putting on the psyche of civilization.

The Burden of Blood

Whatever inherent evil there may be in the activities of war, the responsibility for it lies much more with the civil society which decides on war than with the combat soldier who fights it. The soldier is but the point of the weapon which his society takes up and wields. Yet the combat soldier is in a position to know what death and killing in war mean—and here lies the great tension that war puts on modern society. The soldier sends the lethal bullet, releases the obliterating bomb, stabs with the bayonet, swings the butt of the rifle to the groin. The soldier enters the town that has just been pulverized with artillery fire and faces the civilians. The soldier puts his body in the way of heat, cold, water, mud, fire, steel, disease, dirt, sleeplessness, and loneliness. He registers in body and mind the mutilations of the hells he has gone through.

The civilian part of society lays this burden on the soldier, and cannot make it up to him. Vote him higher and higher pay, give him better and better equipment, surround him with more and more comforts, watch over his family, pension his widow and orphan, succor him with wonderful medicines, patch him up more and more cleverly, send him to finer and finer hospitals, bury him under bigger and bigger monuments—both he and the rest of society know in their hearts that it is no use. The soldier only grows more cynical and melancholy; the civilian only feels more troubled. The evil is war and killing. This is the burden the civilian has been trying to avoid, and the combat soldier cannot get rid of.

For years following World War I the returning veteran tried in every way to rid himself of the blood and the smell of death and the hurts and wounds which he carried from the war. Yet they followed him back into his family life, into his business, into his recreation, and often struck years later, to separate him from wife, family, and work, and perhaps send him back to the veterans' hospital, or bring a sudden end to his life.

The art and literature of the period—much of it the work of returned soldiers—reflected this same effort somehow to remove the burden of blood and death from the psyches of sensitive men: *Three Soldiers, All Quiet on the Western Front, Farewell to Arms, What Price Glory*—these books all told of the difficulty of communicating what had happened, of the disintegration of accepted ideals and values, of the meaninglessness of "noble" words. They told of the effort to find release in excitement and raw sensations, in city lights and crowded dance floors, in flight from the small towns and from the routine of normal living, in the irresponsible gaiety of foreign capitals, in the continued violence of big game hunting and the blood of the bull ring.

They reflected the pit of despair into which civilization seemed to be falling, as in Eliot's *The Waste Land;* the longing to find again the simpler world and faith of youth, as in Thomas Wolfe's *Look Homeward, Angel;* the effort to find the material causes for what had happened, as in the later books of John Dos Passos. Yet over all this literature there hangs the sense of disillusion, doubt, unbelief. Nausea seemed to pervade it. Perhaps the most frequent episode in all these books was that of people vomiting. A generation had swallowed something it could not keep down. What was it but human blood?

Soldiers are already returning from a second terrible experience of destruction and death. What will be their deeper, delayed reaction this time? Will their efforts at release end again in flight and excitement, in nausea and revulsion? Will they again stop short of uncovering the real center of hurt and opening the way to a true cure?

The pacifist has refused to add to the social destructiveness of war, but has been willing to help constructively where he might. He has been willing to share the soldier's life and discipline, bind his wounds, and carry him from the field of battle, aid in medical research, tend the sick, feed the hungry, and join with the soldier and with any one else to build the kind of world in which war will not be necessary. The pacifist alone has refused to join in requiring the soldier to be a butcher for society. He alone has stood against the method of killing and been willing to take the consequences of that stand.

Soldier and pacifist may join in saying to the other members of their society: you cannot forever avoid this choice! One day you must take either the way of the soldier, who learns what it is to take the blood of his fellow men and see his comrades fall all about him—or you must take the way of the pacifist who renounces war and faces the skepticism of a materialistic world. This is what lies on the soul of society itself—that it has not as yet made this choice. And so it feels guilty toward both its sons it has forced to choose, both the soldier and the objector. But one day it, too, must decide, and lift the burden that lies across the psyche of civilization.

Meanwhile, the soldier and the pacifist of this present war, whatever they may think of each other's views, may well greet each other as brothers as they come back from the strange places that war has taken them, carrying each one his own peculiar burden.

Religious Life in Germany

By F. SIEGMUND-SCHULTZE*

RELIGIOUS LIFE IN GERMANY today is governed by three circumstances having their rise in recent history.

I

The National Socialist movement stirred the spiritual life of the German people to an extraordinary degree. Regarded as a religious movement, National Socialism was successor to the nationalist movement which for decades past had been bringing about an emotional transformation in German sentiment towards Christianity. Stronger even that materialism and nihilism, this nationalist movement took hold of large numbers of the youth and filled them with ideals which actually claimed to be pagan, in opposition to traditional Christianity. National Socialism fastened on to this prevailing mood. At times Hitler thought that with the help of Rosenberg and other supporters of a religion of the German myth he could form a German Church to enter on the inheritance of the Catholic and Protestant Churches. But the National Socialist Führer soon had to realize that Christianity was still more firmly rooted in the people. Only the inner circles of the Party supported the religious movement that had its origin in National Socialism.

As a result of the storm which was aroused, the Churches realized more clearly than before their own purpose and task. Against the German Christian movement there arose the Confessional Church, in West Germany strongly theological, but in the south and east springing more from the practical ecclesiastical side. Similarly a strong opposition movement showed itself in Catholic Christianity; although for a time it strove for a friendly adjustment or relationship towards National Socialism, as time went on it also developed into a Christion resistance movement. At the outbreak of the Second World War, Protestant and Catholic circles had just united to form a common resistance movement. Then war propaganda began and the Churches in general placed themselves at the service of the nation. This was true in particular of the Confessional Church and the Catholic groups, which up to then had opposed National Socialism. At times it looked as though confessional Christianity had been swallowed up by the flood of war; but gradually it came to the surface again, though now not so much in a confessional form, but with a strongly ethical emphasis which up to then had only been noticeable in a relatively small religious resistance group.

II

This ethical religious wave, which made itself felt soon after the National Socialists seized power, but which had an even harder struggle against National Socialism than confessional Christianity, grew during the war and even indeed on account of the events of the war to a strong inner opposition against the militaristic-nationalistic war spirit. People of all groups and parties shared in this movement. It was naturally harder for them to speak out publicly than for those who were opposed to the National Socialist spirit on purely ecclesiastical ground. The *tens of thousands of martyrs* who were put to death, many during the six years of National Socialism preceding the outbreak of war, and even more during the course of it, came from these circles. Varied religious forces were mingled in this opposition: there were the Jehovah's Witnesses, who now refused military conscription as steadfastly as formerly they had confessed their faith. There were the genuinely convinced friends of international reconciliation who did not believe in the war propaganda. There were those who saw in the terrible happenings the coming of the end of the world, and from eschatological belief fought against the general indifference. There were the deeply convinced socialists, who took up the fight against dictatorship without regard to party, even after their organizations had been destroyed. And chiefly there were the Communists, who had remained true to their cause and now recognized more clearly than ever the necessity of a last stand. All those ethical-religious groups, among which political and other motives were mixed with the spiritual motives, represented a religious revival which is now making itself more and more apparent.

III

But at the present time the picture is predominantly affected by a third attitude, one which is not alone known to the initiates but which has confronted strangers recently: and that is the profound apathy which has settled on the people. Two years of dictatorship are alone sufficient to induce a mood of deep resignation in the spiritual leaders of a nation who see that all their efforts against force are useless. The six years up to the outbreak of the war laid heavy fetters on the forces of freedom among the German people. The brutal methods of the Gestapo have had an effect as powerful as the violence of the GPU in Russia or the long years of Italian fascism. War made it possible to silence all opposition. The prospects of opposition, still existing before the war, diminished steadily as it went on. Since the majority were at the beginning of the war deprived of their freedom to lead and came under the control of the S.S., the efforts of some few less courageous leaders during the war were sure to fail. Among the middle and lower classes, who were not in a position to keep up contacts throughout the Reich, apathy was continually increasing. The only hope for an ending of the difficulties was seen in the removal of National Socialism from outside. Then the bombing of German cities began, and the people no longer believed that the Anglo-Saxon peoples really desired to bring peace to the world. As the sufferings of the civil population became more frightful, as more and more people were killed by the terror-bombing, as greater and greater numbers were evacuated and became homeless, the apathy grew. The people saw no hope in any direction. And their attitude to religion was very strongly conditioned by these events. The majority of people lost faith in God, because they could no longer trust their fellowmen. Today that is perhaps the most obvious character-

* Chairman, Executive Committee of the International F.O.R.

istic of the inward condition of the German people.

Yet it is no contradiction to say that some few, who are not submerged in this profound resignation, are yet finding a way out through religion. There are those who have been thrown back, in this utter despair, on God—and there lies hope for the new life of the German people. But to reach such a faith involves a difficult spiritual process. These people need encouragement at least by those who claim to be led by God. If even those who themselves believe in divine power and look for it, do not come to their aid, these people who have been in despair will indeed not be able to find God.

Today perhaps more than ever before the question of faith is for the German people a question of fellowship. Only if Christianity shows itself to be a power that goes beyond national frontiers will Christianity become in Germany a force for the inward renewal of men. No one who knows the circumstances can doubt that the Anglo-Saxon people, who bear the Christian message and proclaim it, have here a special duty.

Conscience Against the Atomic Bomb

By A. J. MUSTE

THE LEAD EDITORIAL in *Life* on August 20, 1945, the first issue to appear after the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, carried the following statement:

> "Our sole safeguard against the very real danger of a reversion to barbarism is the kind of morality which compels the individual conscience, be the group right or wrong. The individual conscience against the atomic bomb? Yes. There is no other way."

Very likely many persons regarded this as a piece of effective journalism: clever writer, this man Luce—or one of his scribes. Actually this text from *Life* sets forth a profound and simple truth on which we shall do well to meditate.

"The individual conscience against the atomic bomb?" Precisely. "When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, what is man that Thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that Thou visitest him? Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels." Always, from one point of view, man has seemed utterly and tragically pretentious and insignficant, a very thin-skinned, sensitive, defenseless animal infesting an insignificant planet. But it is man who is visited by God. It is man whose mind penetrates the secret of the atom and releases atomic energy. It is man, the individual human being, who is constantly confronted with the necessity, the inescapable demand, to make a moral decision, to choose: Whether to use atomic energy for this purpose or that. Whether to make atomic bombs. Whether, having made them, to use them. Whether, having used them once, twice, to use them again.

Individual human beings must face the moral issue whether as political leaders they shall go on to make preparations for atomic warfare, or to abolish war at long last. Individual human beings before God and conscience must answer the question whether they will again consent to be conscripted "against their will" if a government decides to embark on atomic warfare. Individual Christian ministers must decide whether they can continue to profess Christianity and at the same time tell young men that, though war is a terrible thing and the church as such cannot possibly bless it, nevertheless, the only thing they as citizens can do is to "go along with the government."

Many people see now in a new way that the only thing that can be set over against the atomic bomb, and indeed set over the atomic bomb, is the invisible force, the spiritual reality of conscience, of God incarnate in the human heart. When you have a brain that can unveil the innermost secrets of the physical universe and can release its deeply hidden energies, you *have to have a conscience to match that brain,* or catastrophe is certain. Suddenly we realize that simple goodness is needed, or life will become a nightmare until it is extinguished altogether.

This truth that human destiny, perhaps even the very survival of man on earth, depends on the individual conscience, on the man who will not bow the knee even though he stand alone or be cast into a fiery furnace or nailed to a cross, has been neglected and even rejected by our age. We do as the crowd does; we go as the crowd goes; we conform. Very generally in church circles, even sometimes among pacifists, there has been a tendency to minimize the significance and power—even to question the validity—of conscientious objection. People have been in the habit of saying that the conscientious objector is negative, an anarchist; that standing out as an individual may have something rather noble about it, and require some courage, but is usually madness resulting from exhibitionism, a martyr-complex, or something of the sort; and that, anyway, the only action which really counts is that by large bodies of men.

Suddenly we are confronted with the atomic bomb, end-product of an age of mechanism, of power, of mass-action, of totalitarianism, an age which looked down upon the individual and placed its faith in systems. And with the atomic bomb comes the revelation that the vast, impersonal forces which have created it have driven us to the edge of the abyss and are about to drive us over. What force now are we to counterpose to them? Whence is our salvation? And the answer is the individual conscience. The individual human being, standing alone in the presence of God, faced with the awful demand to make a decision—a decision for himself, regardless of whether anyone else joins with him or not. There we are face to face with Reality, with power in the ultimate sense. When the decision is on God's side, this power is released into human life, into history. God himself acts through men whose integrity is complete, who are prepared to act alone, who bow the knee to God and therefore will not bow the knee to any man or institution.

The drama of the individual conscience against the atomic bomb was presented many centuries ago in a

slightly different form according to the book of Daniel. Three young men said: "Be it known unto thee, O King, that we will not worship thy god, nor bow before the image which thou hast made." They were conscientious objectors. But when they were cast into the fiery furnace, the king was amazed to see with them a fourth, and "the countenance of the fourth was like that of the son of God."

Let the conscientious objectors of World War II take heart. They incarnated "the kind of morality" which is "our sole safeguard against the very real possibility of a reversion to barbarism" because it "compels the individual conscience, be the group right or wrong."

Let others, and especially all who profess to be Christians and among them especially all ministers and religious leaders, face the ultimate decision whether they can any longer refuse to join the ranks of conscientious objectors against war. We do indeed need concerted social and political action, but even here it is a serious question whether governments will act unless there is a sufficiently large minority to take the stand that they cannot be counted upon for anything except opposition if governments embark upon atomic war. Contrariwise, if even a substantial percentage of those who profess to be Christians would do this, governments would find the way out of the present dilemma. However that may be, each individual must make his personal decision.

Conscience and the Atomic Scientists

It is of the greatest significance that the physicists who worked on the bomb seem to have become aware of the ethical issues which have been raised. A heavy responsibility rests upon them and upon their predecessors in recent generations. The prevalent attitude among them has been an a-moral, if not an anti-moral one. It was their business to penetrate the secrets of nature, to help the technicians to make practical use of their studies. But it was generally held that whether these instruments were used for destructive or constructive purposes was of no concern to the scientist. Beyond being "objective" and faithful to the truth in his own special field, he had no moral and social responsibility.

In recent weeks, however, it has become evident that large groups of physicists, headed by Dr. Samuel Allison in Chicago, where he is Director of the Institute of Nuclear Studies at the University of Chicago, and by Robert R. Wilson in Los Alamos, N. M., are profoundly disturbed and are demanding action to internationalize the control of atomic energy. They openly protested against the censorship the War Department imposed upon them. They even talked like workmen or conscientious objectors about going on strike if the government kept them at work on atomic bombs and refused to allow them to go to work on constructive uses of atomic energy!

If these scientists have now realized the danger and sin of releasing forces which one cannot control and the responsibility of the individual for processes in which he participates, then they have come to understand the sin of war, which is essentially a releasing of forces which cannot be directed and controlled. They have also recognized the validity and necessity of conscientious objection.

They are themselves, because of their past failure to recognize these things, largely responsible for the fearful situation in which the world finds itself. They did not act upon the truly moral and religious principle enunciated by their colleague in the study of the atom, the Austrian Lise Meitner, who said after the bomb had been employed to slaughter human beings: "I, like any other responsible person, hoped that its practical realization would not be possible. . . . The scientist is ever awe-struck at the discovery of the laws of nature, and to use these laws for the construction of weapons which might lead to the annihilation of mankind, must seem blasphemy to him." Instead, they went into the service of the government in order to make the bomb. They were instrumental in enlisting hundreds of technicians and thousands of workers in an enterprise, the nature of which the latter did not understand. We are truly lost if in the atomic age men will lend themselves to working in enterprises whose purpose they do not understand. But the greatest scientists in this country actually got men to do that on an immense scale. They connived at the expenditure of two billions of the taxpayers' money without any notion on the part of the latter as to what the money was being spent for. It appears now that many of them at any rate were outraged over the fact that bombs were dropped on thickly populated areas instead of on an uninhabited island. If political leaders betrayed them at this point, and were able to do so, it was because for months they had been the pliant tools of these political leaders in a vast project which meant putting precisely such frightful powers into the hands of fallible men motivated primarily by nationalistic, political considerations.

If some scientists are now repudiating such actions and the whole attitude of ethical indifferentism and of unconcern about social issues, it is cause for the utmost gratitude and hope. The effects will be beneficently revolutionary if atomic scientists are now determined that they will permit their talents and their discoveries to be used only for human good. Had the scientists of the world, in the true spirit of science, gotten together on that basis some years ago, the war would have been needless and in fact impossible. If they will get together on that basis now, war can be abolished.

But it will be necessary that they act with a mighty moral passion and an unflagging and unconquerable determination and with utter disregard for personal consequences to themselves. The goal cannot be won at less cost. The forces of inertia, of doubt, of fear, of narrow nationalism, of confused vision, of half-baked thinking, are certain to produce failure, compromise, betrayal, some pseudo-solution—rather than the abolition of war—unless there is moral and spiritual force to match them. The scientist who supports or condones a nationalistic foreign policy, a big military establishment, and peacetime conscription while professedly working to abolish the bomb and internationalize the control of atomic energy—the scientist who is not prepared to be a conscientious objector against any further work on atomic bombs or similar instruments of destruction and against any service to an administration which retains the bomb and prepares for atomic warfare—is, whatever his intentions, an enemy of mankind and a traitor to both science and religion. "The individual conscience against the atomic bomb? Yes. There is no other way."

The Joy of the Lord

A GROUP OF MEDITATIONS BY PHILIPPE VERNIER

Translated by EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE

Enter Thou Into the Joy of Thy Lord

—Matthew 25:21

From our human point of view salvation is the conquest of joy. What change has come over the life of a man who has just met with the Lord? Scarcely any, it would seem: he has kept his profession, his friends, his outstanding habits. One thing is different, however: he has "entered into joy."

The landscape remains the same, but the sun brightens it, and suddenly everything is new: the world is another world. Ask this man to explain to you what he feels, to describe to you what the Master has given him; he will answer "I am happy!"

This does not mean that cares, griefs, and even faults are henceforth spared him. Perhaps he will seek, suffer, strive more than before, but nothing of all this will rob him of that intimate gladness into which his heart has entered, and which is called the joy of the Lord.

Some believe that one does not fathom joy until after death. It may well be that until that time nothing will ever be perfect, but the Master gives to all his servants here below a foretaste of eternal happiness.

It is right away, in the very midst of the trivialities and difficulties of your earthly life, that he comes to say to you, as to the faithful laborer in the parable: "Well done." He doesn't wait for you to gather in the five other talents and win your reward. He doesn't want you to doubt of your success until the very end of your effort. From now on, as one pays an installment on an unheard-of salary, or as a great favor lets excited children catch a glimpse of the Christmas tree before the great day, he is ready to make you enter into his joy.

Walk In Love

—Ephesians 5:2

Thus charity—or love—seems to be indeed the road which leads to life eternal. It is a road that your Master has laid out, and upon which he invites you to follow him.

The kingdom of love is never a fixed point where one may settle down. Your union with God, if it remained inactive, would become darkened and would diminish. Even human tenderness will gradually cool if it is not renewed and reinforced.

Love is a march forward, a succession of conquests, a series of discoveries. The windings of the road unveil one by one before the traveler the beauties of picturesque scenery. In the same way charity reveals each day new treasures to whoever advances along it. Today you feel the simple joy of making a little happiness spring up around you, tomorrow it will be given you to forget forever all your grievances and your grudges. One day perhaps you will be admitted to the even rarer joy of suffering for your Master. These all are only successive landscapes in the beautiful kingdom of love.

But if love is a journey, it was not said that you should walk *toward* it, but *in* it. You must establish yourself without delay right in the middle of this road which promises you such splendid discoveries. You will go forward on it and at the same time remain fixed in it, as in walking one remains always on the road and in the atmosphere.

Love is the indispensable atmosphere for the life of your soul: it is within such that your soul breathes, grows, and acts. It is within such that it finds union with God, for "God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him."

He That Hath No Sword, Let Him Sell His Garment, and Buy One

—Luke. 22:36

The Master who advises you here to buy a sword is still the same who said: "Love your enemies. Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." He is likewise the same who forbade the use of the sword for defense. So then? Of what sword is he now speaking?

He means, I think, that there are times when a comfortable and soft religion, in which one is as warm as inside a cloak, is no longer sufficient for whoever wants to be his disciple. Up until now everything had been easy. One had only to follow Jesus along flowery roads, and listen to his parables. But now everything is going to change. The hour of peace is over. The opposition is defining itself. The Master will be put to death and his disciples left alone, obliged to fight day by day for the life of their souls or see them perish. Are they armed for this battle? Or have they nothing with which to defend themselves but the tepidness of tradition, the timid equipment of old habits? If such is the case, defeat is certain.

The weapon that they need is the sword of the Spirit. Do they have this two-edged sword of which the Scripture speaks, this power of faith which cuts the Adversary in pieces, this heart which has no fear of trial and suffering? On the eve of great engagements is your soul bundled up, more than half benumbed in the cloak of tradition, or do you feel it to be, like that of Jesus, finely tempered as a sword that God would hold in his hand? The times are hard; go sell your garment and buy a sword.

Give Ye Them to Eat

—Mark 6:37

We too do what the disciples did: when we see that famished crowd we approach the Master and say to him, "Send them away into the villages!"

These poor people have come to us naïvely thinking that we can feed them all, that our Master has given us the wherewithal to satisfy their every need: the misery of their bodies, the doubts of their spirits, the ache of

their empty hearts. There they wait and we, besieged by them, take fright: "Send them away! Allow us to direct them to doctors, philosophers, 'specialists,' which we are not!"

But Jesus never doubts of his mission, nor of the treasures of his Father: "Give ye them to eat!" He commands us to make the guests sit down, to start serving them, in spite of the torturing anguish that there will not be enough, that we shall be considered imposters and reviled.

Well we know that it is divine nourishment they expect, and here we have nothing but our poor loaves of barley. No matter, we must distribute them; we must bring what we have and what we are—ourselves give them to eat.

He waits for this, the offering of our scanty resources, before opening the gates of his mysterious treasures.

He wants us to have the daring of Abraham, raising the altar without having the victim, and when we are asked, "Where is the lamb for the burnt offering?" to answer, "God will provide it."

He Saw Them Toiling in Rowing

—Mark 6:48

Doesn't it seem marvelous to you that the Master thus concerns himself with our troubles?

The disciples believe themselves to be alone in their fight against the sea; they do not suspect that Jesus watches their journey. Having remained ashore to pray, from the top of a hill he assists their striving; he weighs their danger, he sees the ineffectiveness of their efforts, the violence of the growing storm, the weakening of their courage and their strength. He knows already at what moment he will have to intervene, he knows that in the fourth watch he will go to them by walking on the water. Isn't this as though he were with them in the boat? Isn't this look, which discovers and appreciates their difficulty, as good as deliverance?

The same attentive eye follows you too in your troubles. You hear it said: "God does not concern himself with the world, since he leaves it a prey to such torments."

You yourself know that the Master is near by, that he watches and sees everything. If he does not intervene it is no doubt because he decides that you have not yet struggled hard enough. The fourth watch has not yet sounded; while waiting for it, you hold on as best you can.

The disciples did not suspect that the Master saw them. You, however, know it. The Bible is there to assure you that the Father sees you, that from on high he surveys the course and is ready to hasten to you when you can no longer hold the oars.

Courage, then! The higher the waves, the more your boat ships water, the more exhausted you grow, the nearer draws the hour of your relief, when he will appear and restore the sea to calm.

Your Sorrow Shall Be Turned Into Joy

—John 16:20

This is the wonderful metamorphosis that your Master performs, and he performs it wherever he appears.

It seems as though he possesses the seed of joy, and deposits it gently in your heart without your knowledge, just at the moment of your darkest despairs. Your distress is the fertile soil in which this plant can grow. There it sprouts patiently, almost timidly, and then soars toward the sky like a song of hope.

Sometimes one feels this upon the occasion of a cruel mourning. Everywhere is night and an absolute dead end, but admit him only to a corner of your sorrow; soon he will show you a faint gleam at the end of the tunnel through which you walk, and then the gleam will become full daylight dispelling the darkness.

There are some sorrows in which remorse is mixed, where you accuse yourself even more than you grieve, where you twist and turn like an evil-doer in his cell. Let the Master enter your cell, he will soon cast down the walls and restore peace to you.

But what about that most genuine distress? That in which you no longer know whom to call for help, that into which the apostles sank when their Master had been killed? It is here above all that he performs the real metamorphosis: one no longer calls him, but he approaches anyway; he stretches his hand over this sadness, to change it into joy. He no longer comes to brighten your way, like a companion who would walk beside you, but inwardly he dwells in your life, he fixes in your heart his permanent sun, he plants so deeply within you his seed of joy that nothing in the world can uproot it.

"Incorrigibly Christian"

By ALLAN HUNTER

Every day during the years of the war I wondered how Philippe Vernier and his family were faring in Belgium. In 1938 his conscience led him to stand against conscription and military training. As a result he went to prison, spending nearly two years in solitary confinement. When Philippe was being sentenced the judge asked him what he had to say. His reply was characteristically simple, "I accept the justice of this court for my body. I accept the justice of God for my soul."

"How did you keep from going crazy?" I asked him late one night in 1938 as we hiked along a bicycle path in Holland. He told me that God was so near and real that "the happiness was like that of a rescued child, as if I was on the ocean, all drowned, and then God's arms underneath me lifting me up!"

But on the outbreak of World War II Philippe was imprisoned again. When he finally was released and returned to his family and his mission church in the little mining community near Mons, Belgium, he faced the horror and depression of war on the civilian front, close up and incessant, with his own children cold and half starved, and many of his neighbors going insane from anxiety or being smashed with bombs. Could any man go through *that* experience and keep the lark in his heart singing?"

My question has been answered. A colonel in the United States Army, who had dropped in on the Vernier family at my request, wrote:

"The opportunity is not often afforded a man in a lifetime to go to Heaven but that is where I felt I had been after I left the Vernier household." And in a recent card to me Philippe says: "I feel deeply that we who escaped through so many dangers ought to work all our life long to make a new war impossible."

It is said that a French officer once summarized his report of the baffling character of Philippe Vernier with these two despairing words: "Incorrigibly Christian."

No Adequate Plans for Releasing CO's in Prisons and CPS Camps

Conscientious objectors to war are still being held in prisons and in the "forced labor" program of Civilian Public Service in spite of the fact that the war has ended. Three and a half months after its ending some 3,000 men were in prison, and the Department of Justice had made no recommendation for relaxation of the parole policy. On the other hand, men were still being given prison sentences. A few of these were new cases but a larger number were the result of court procedure lags so that sentences were being handed out for violations occurring last spring. Approximately 30 men were being sent to prison each month under these conditions. Figures released by the Department recently show that a "total of 13,986 convictions of all types" have been made under the Selective Service Act between June 30, 1940 and June 30, 1945. Of that number 5,516 have taken their stand as conscientious objectors or as Jehovah's Witnesses.

Demobilization of Civilian Public Service has finally been started but has made little progress toward a return to normal living of some 8,000 men from the camps and institutions. Up to October 30, 1945, provision had been made for the release of 105 men 39 years old or older, and for a few men who were 38. Just before Thanksgiving Day, a directive issued by Selective Service to all camps and institutions using CO's provided for applications for demobilization from men who will come under any of the following conditions on or before December 31, 1945: (1) 38 years of age, (2) 35 years of age and two years of service, (3) four years of service. The same directive stated that no further plans for demobilization would be announced this year. Simultaneously, men were being sent to camp at the rate of approximately 50 a month.

Groups Withdraw Support

Some of the groups that have co-operated with Civilian Public Service are announcing withdrawal from NSBRO, now that the war is over, and this kind of action may speed up plans for the release of the 8,000 men now in camp. In October two such groups notified NSBRO that they were withdrawing from the program. The American Friends Service Committee stated that it would "conclude its administration of CPS camps and units not later than March 2, 1946." The other group to take action was the Association of Catholic Conscientious Objectors — "one of the four original religious agencies to sponsor the ill-fated program." Notice was sent to NSBRO on October 30 by the ACCO that they were withdrawing from membership at once and requesting "that this withdrawal of the ACCO be duly recognized by striking the Association's name from the NSBRO letterhead and list of members, and by making proper announcement of this action in *The Reporter* and other NSBRO information outlets."

In discussing the release of CO's, *Christian Century* said editorially in the October 10, 1945, issue that we now need "an aroused Christian and civic conscience" to recognize that "religious freedom . . . is still the heart of all of our other freedoms." In declaring that "it has been conscience that has sent these men to prison and to CPS camps," the editorial calls upon "the conscience of Christian citizens" to demand "that those who are behind bars be freed, and those in the camps be given the same treatment as other draftees in obtaining their discharges." In making this declaration, the editorial asserts that Selective Service has not developed a plan for demobilization of CO's because "this branch of the Army is terrorized by the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars."

FOR members are urged to write President Truman suggesting that he signalize his first Christmas in office to provide amnesty for all conscientious objectors on the ground that it is unnecessary and scandalous that anyone should be in prison for objection to war, now that the war is over; likewise, to urge the President to make some plan for demobilizing CPS men on an equal basis with draftees who have been in the armed services.

Council Statement Hits Militarism and Imperialism

The FOR National Council, meeting in New York City November 15-17, authorized the sending of three letters to President Truman to include statements on imperialism in the East, peacetime military conscription, and the food needs of many countries. The letters on conscription and Indonesia were sent also to Secretary of State Byrnes.

The conscription statement recognizes as an important step in the right direction the Truman-Attlee-King proposal that a commission be set up under the United Nations Organization "at the earliest practicable date" for the purpose of attaining "the most effective means of entirely eliminating the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes and promoting its widest use for industrial and humanitarian purposes." Approval was expressed of their recognition of the fact that prevention of war is the only means of protecting the civilized world from "the destructive use of scientific knowledge." And the Council felt encouraged by Secretary Byrnes' statements before a Charleston, S. C., audience when he said: "It is not enough to banish atomic war. We must banish war. To that great goal of humanity we must ever rededicate our hearts and strength."

The Council statement then declared: ". . . it is only in an atmosphere of mutual confidence that action toward removing the threat of atomic warfare can make progress. It is this spirit of trust and confidence which is conspicuously lacking in international relations today. It is inconceivable that other nations will be able to believe that we are sincere in our proposals to deal with the atomic bomb and to eliminate war, if at the same time we move in the exactly opposite direction and for the first time in the peacetime history of this nation institute compulsory universal military training, i.e., conscription.

"We call upon the President, therefore, to withdraw his proposal for peacetime conscription and to join with Congress in proposing that all nations join in abolishing national military establishments and conscription by agreement."

Imperialism in the East

The full statement regarding imperialism in the Far East follows:

"We are shocked and grieved at the reports of the bloody suppression of the struggle for independence being waged by the people of Indonesia. Since the military action taken is carried out under arrangements made by the Allied powers, the United States is clearly involved, shares in the guilt of this imperialist action, and will have to bear the consequences in the loss of respect and honor in which the peoples of the Far East have held this nation.

"The shameful and dangerous situation in Indonesia should be terminated without delay. The leaders of the Independence movement in Indonesia have appealed to President Truman. So far as is known, the receipt of that appeal has not even been acknowledged. We urge the President to respond immediately and to use his good offices with the British and Dutch governments to the end that hostilities may cease and machinery for conference may be set up. Only thus can a sound and peaceful solution be worked out for the complicated problems involved in the removal of imperialist control from Indonesia and in securing responsible participation by its people in working out the relations between the nations of the Orient and the Occident."

Hunger and Plenty

Prompt provision for "more adequate relief for the undernourished victims of war in Europe and the Orient, not ex-

cluding those who have lately been enemies" was urged. This statement contrasted the abundance of food in the the United States, as reported recently by Secretary Anderson, with the tragic situation in other parts of the world, and called upon the President to take whatever steps might be necessary—either through UNRRA or through Army stock piles now in some of these countries—to relieve the starvation that prevails. "A God-fearing and Christian people," the statement declared, "in the hour of thanksgiving for victory would do well to obey Christ's commandment of merciful love, even to enemies, and also that earlier requirement of the Hebrew religion 'to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God'."

Help the Forerunners

At the Philadelphia FOR anniversary dinner Max Adams of the National Council said, "Forerunners should be a first on our program. We must reach high school people with our message as rapidly as possible." Plans for translating this need into an accomplished fact are outlined below:

(1) The Forerunners Advisory Committee in reviewing objectives recently said, "With the war 'over' we should move more and more toward the pacifist approach. High school young people should be encouraged to think through their position. They must be helped, through program material geared to high school age, to grapple with the problems that prevent world brotherhood and to do something about them in the spirit of reconciliation."

(2) Three approaches to the implementation of the Forerunners' program are to be followed in this order: promotion of materials through existing agencies, enlisting of individual membership through the monthly paper *The Forerunner,* organization of clubs in such places as seem especially to require that approach.

(3) The following Forerunners' materials are planned:

a. Four promotion leaflets and a pledge card to be ready in December.
b. New booklet on pacifism, now in process of being printed.
c. Four leaflets to sell for about 10¢ each will be ready in January. They will appear under such titles as: *What's Happening in Europe and Asia, Stories of Forerunners, Action Projects, Bibliography.*
d. A series of articles in *The Forerunner* on the atomic bomb and the United Nations Charter, to be reprinted in leaflet form in the spring.

If you are a youth leader and would like to help with Forerunners, write to Hazel Brownson, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

Sandstone Strike

Five CO's are in administrative segregation at the Sandstone, Minn., prison. Malcolm Parker, Glenn Hutchinson, Charles Worley, Edward J. Adamowicz and Walter Gormley notified the Attorney General, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, and the Warden of their intention to go on a work strike with the following statement:

"We, the undersigned, being held prisoners at the F.C.I. at Sandstone, Minn., are conscientiously opposed to working in co-operation with the Federal Prison System for the following reasons:

"We believe that the government is unjustified in imprisoning conscientious objectors to war since such imprisonment is a denial of every person's right to freedom of conscience.

"We further believe that the Federal Prison System is detrimental to society in that it tends to destroy the character and personality of inmates and develops anti-social attitudes. It does this through unnecessary restrictions, authoritarian control, and the lack of any truly rehabilitative program."

The men signified their intention to discontinue working for the Federal Prison System on October 1, 1945, and in the event authorities imposed further punitive measures, to begin fasting as a protest.

Edward Adamowicz has written in a recent letter: ". . . you ask if I believe prisons can be reformed from within. My answer is no. Neither from without. I don't believe any of us in this group entirely believes that prisons are even necessary. Some may say—how should society restrain animals? I can only say that prisons do not at present, nor in the past, restrain or eliminate criminal tendencies, but rather create criminal and anti-social attitudes. Since the Federal Prison System is only a detriment to society, would it not be better to abolish them entirely and get at the causes of crime instead?"

Greetings to Prison CO's

Many members will want to send Christmas greetings to conscientious objectors in prison again this year. The national office has prepared a list of FOR members in prison, which will be sent upon request. A staff member now in prison calls attention to the fact that a flood of Christmas mail to the more popular CO's is sometimes embarrassing in view of the fact that most inmates get little or no mail. One suggestion might be that Christmas cards be sent to CO's without signatures, or with the signature on a separate slip of paper. The card could then be passed on to give pleasure to some other inmate.

Conscription Drive Gains

The drive for peacetime conscription is in a crucial stage. For the first time in recent months there is serious danger that a majority of Congressmen will be prepared to vote for a conscription proposal. Factors contributing to this change of atmosphere are the personal telegram of the President to the American Legion Convention and the subsequent unanimous vote of the Legion favoring conscription, the strong speech of General Eisenhower broadcast from the Legion convention, and the wide newspaper publicity given to the advocates of conscription in the Public Hearings of the House Military Affairs Committee. In addition to this, members of Congress—especially those of the Military Affairs Committee—are under strong pressure from the administration to support conscription. Even the Roman Catholic Bishops, evidently under strong pressure of an anti-Russian nature, indicated that they were prepared to accept conscription if it were integrated with the school system.

Only some very effective publicity on a national scale and a considerable number of letters to Congressmen will reverse this trend toward conscription. Much can also be done by personal visits to Congressmen in Washington or when they are at home over the Christmas holidays.

Staff Changes

Glenn Smiley has been paroled unconditionally and permitted to resume his work as regional FOR secretary for Southern California with headquarters in Los Angeles.

A. Stauffer Curry is the new Connecticut Valley secretary, working on a part-time basis. Mr. Curry has been working with the Church of the Brethren in the southeastern states.

On January 1, Leslie Simon will begin his work as the new secretary for rural work. He is a Methodist minister and comes to the FOR staff from a long experience in rural pastorates.

FOR Field Secretaries

South: Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville 4, Tenn.; *Midwest:* Emerson Schwenk, 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Ill.; *Northwest:* Mary Farquharson, 1406 East 40th St., Seattle 5, Wash.; *Northern California:* Orval Etter, 2151 Vine Street, Berkeley 7, Cal.; *Southwest:* Glenn Smiley, 3302 S. Grand Ave., Los Angeles 7, Cal.; *Rocky Mountain:* Margaret Eberhard, 440 E. 13th Ave., Denver 3, Colo.; *Action Projects:* George Houser, 1850 E. 81st St., Cleveland 3, Ohio; *Middle Atlantic:* James E. Bristol, Room 900, 1831 Chestnut St., Philadelphia 3, Pa.

FELLOWSHIP AROUND THE WORLD

Japan—An FOR member connected with the occupying forces in Japan writes that he has seen Timita, Sassakura, and Kora, all FOR members, that they "are well and carrying on in the same capacities they occupied before the war. In general, there have been few casualties (among FOR members)." He tells of having talked with Rev. Michio Kosaki, pastor of the Reinanzaka Church and formerly head of the Tokio FOR, and also with Kagawa. He found Kagawa taking an active part in the affairs of reconstruction and holding "high hopes for a labor victory if the elections are held at such a time as will permit them a maximum approach to the people, which means holding them after the winter cold and snow is gone." The writer feels that in some ways "the occupation has been a great shock both to the Americans and the Japanese here. The Yanks found the Japanese a pleasant, courteous and dignified people, one with whom they could not help fraternizing extensively. (There are no bars to that, by the way.) The Japanese on their side expected to find a horde of rapists and looters descend upon them, and they too have been pleasantly surprised. . . . Credit lies with both sides: the Japanese understood that friendliness would beget its like, and the Americans are constitutionally unable to return a smile with a frown." The writer goes on to say that leaving the Emperor in power in Japan was "a political decision based on a correct theory of the facts" and that "probably a hundred thousand American soldiers owe their lives to that decision."

* * *

Germany—"The horrible heritage which the war left for Germany is pressing mostly about those who were not responsible for the war and who had to suffer as the helpless and defenseless victims of all its horrors. Thousands and thousands have lost their homes. An endless stream of fugitives is coming into these parts of the country looking for food and shelter, for clothing and new jobs. Families are split up; parents are looking for their children, boys and girls are traveling through the country in order to seek their parents. Fortunes have been destroyed, and many have lost all means of supporting themselves and their families. This winter will be the hardest in our memory. It is uncertain whether we will be able to raise the babies born this year. *In one German city, of* 109 *new-born babies* 98 *died in the same month, July.* Since most German homes will be very inadequately heated during the winter, we need everything to keep warm—warm clothing, especially coats, warm blankets, warm suits and, most of all, solid shoes," writes a friend from Hannover.

Pastor Wilhelm Mensching's house at Petzen, Westfalia, is "full to overflowing with relatives from the Russian zone, and from Silesia which has now been handed over to Poland. In the absence of official schools, Pastor Mensching conducts classes for the children and holds peace meetings. Some 70 people gathered for one of these meetings and expressed a strong concern that British Friends and others try to undertake work in the Russian zone of occupation. Pastor Mensching stressed the value of fellowship in rebuilding the shattered foundations of international co-operation."

* * *

Austria—Kaspar Mayr and his wife survived the bombing, but their eldest son, Richard, was killed on Russian soil in 1943, "in the country where he had hoped so much to work for peace and unity amongst the Christian Churches."

* * *

France—Henri Roser writes from Paris to acknowledge receipt of the fourth gift this year from the FOR War Victims Fund. Out of the $2,000 sent to Roser, help has been extended to Philippe Vernier and Pierre Vernier and many others. For instance, the Fund is helping Pierre purchase a sower and put his farm into cultivation. After losing his position in the postal department because he was a CO, Pierre had been installed on a farm in the south of France by an uncle. The uncle was shot or poisoned in prison by the Germans, who took the Vernier farm to make fortifications, and the farm was finally totally destroyed by Allied bombardments. Another gift helps Willy Béguin rebuild a village in the east of France, where 42 men—the main part of the male population—were shot, and still another goes to assist Leylavergne, war name of a journalist, in his work with evacuees in the internment camps. Joseph Szeszekacz, a Polish Jew, is helped to make a new home after returning from a German prison camp to find that his father, mother and youngest brother had been deported to Auschwitz and executed, and that another brother had died in France of sorrow and poverty. Victor Demaude, member of FOR and of Philippe Vernier's parish, is being cared for by the Fund until he is again able to work. He was an invalid when he was deported to Germany and has miraculously returned though he is still too weak to work. These are some of the things Henri Roser is able to do with the help of the War Victims Fund.

* * *

Holland—Cornelis Boeke, a founder of the FOR in Holland, is still living at Bilthoven and making plans for the expansion of his international progressive education school, with children and teachers from all parts of the world. Prof. G. J. Heering, author of *The Fall of Christianity,* is reported to be in good health and very busy with a new booklet to be published under the title *A Voice of Kerk en Vrede.* Nannie Grondhout has been leader of relief work for some 4,500 evacuees in Bilthoven. During the worst months of food shortage, meals were distributed regularly to 650 children. "Kerk en Vrede," the church peace movement, reports that Jan Bosdriesz was imprisoned in two concentration camps, Vught and Dachau, that he received very bad treatment, and is now seriously ill in a hospital.

* * *

Parcels—In view of the bitter needs of our people in Europe this winter, the American Fellowship is expanding the Food and Clothing Parcels Campaign begun some months ago. Headquarters will be retained at the Boston FOR office with Herbert Jehle as director. Edith Woodrow Sayre has given a month's full time to this work on a volunteer basis, and Anna Margaret Atkinson began her work as the employed secretary on December 1. Miss Atkinson is a graduate of the Friends' Reconstruction and Relief Unit at Haverford College. Enrico Molnar is operating at Golden Gate Methodist Church, 61st and Idaho, Oakland, Cal. The program calls for person-to-person sending of 11-pound parcels of food or clothing to addresses in France, Italy, Holland, and Belgium, which will be furnished (with instructions) upon request by Herbert Jehle, 6 Park St., Boston, Mass. The government has not yet opened mail service to Germany and should be urged to do so.

* * *

Ceresole—Friends in all parts of the world were grieved to learn of the death in November of Pierre Ceresole, founder of the International Voluntary Service for Peace. Son of a former President of Switzerland, Pierre suffered imprisonment for conscientious refusal to pay a special military tax. He and Cornelis Boeke became the first co-secretaries of the International FOR in 1919, but after some months Pierre, who believed in "deeds, not words," relinquished this position to launch *Service Civil International.* His first project was reconstruction at Esnes, France, near Verdun, in the winter of 1920-1921. A teacher of mathematics by profession, Pierre liked "to tunnel through mountains of prejudice and establish lines of communication between groups that scarcely spoke to each other before." Under his inspiration and guidance International Voluntary Service for Peace organized work projects in France, Switzerland, Italy, Lichtenstein, Wales, India, Spain, etc., employing thousands of volunteers from many lands.

The Peacemaker's Bookshelf

Negro Strategy

What the Negro Wants. Edited by Rayford W. Logan. University of North Carolina Press. 1944. 352 pp. $3.50.

The one central theme reiterated over and over by these fourteen leading Negroes of America is that the Negro wants just what all men want—freedom, justice, equality, dignity, and opportunity to earn one's bread and to enjoy in peace what one earns, to develop one's own capacities—in short, to be recognized as an equal person by persons.

Quite naturally, therefore, this symposium becomes not a statement of the wants of the Negro, but a series of essays on how these wants can most quickly and adequately be secured. While there is much divergence, but no essential contradiction, in the several strategies proposed, all of them agree in this—that the Negro must himself struggle for these rights against the callousness, the indifference, the arrogance, and the insensitivity of the white peoples. They are unanimous in saying that the struggle is also against the ignorance, the lack of discipline, and the disunity of the colored peoples.

The first of some six proposals in which these fourteen analyses can be classified, accordingly, is the necessity for the self-discipline, solidarity, and purposeful efforts of the Negroes themselves. One may question the wisdom and the practicality of Gordon Hancock's revival of the proposal made years ago by Kelly Miller of Howard University for a "Negro Sanhedrin," a kind of "clearing house for Negro thought and opinion" which would deliberately intend to produce a unified policy and program of Negroes themselves. But one knows what these spokesmen hunger for. Probably Leslie Pinkney Hill is thinking more clearly when he observes, "The Negro will get the things he legitimately wants and strives for only if . . . he will follow leaders who have a known, articulate and unifying philosophy of life adequate to the exactions both of the crisis and to the still more difficult peacetime of reconstruction and rehabilitation."

Another often mentioned strategy is that Negroes become integrated in the labor unions, particularly those of the industrial type, though one writer thinks that the Negro worker can be more effective by establishing unions of his own. A third recommendation is an appeal to the Federal Government to initiate and administer educational and economic policies which the states, particularly Southern states, decline to sponsor. A fourth proposal is to seek by every means for better and more education and social engineering to provide the basic health and intellectual leadership within Negro ranks themselves. A fifth is based on the explicit recognition that the Negro is a special victim of a political and economic system which exploits white as well as colored peoples, and hence is that the Negro must seek his salvation in a common solution of problems common to both races. Still another technique advocated is that of the mass-supported pressure group, such as the March-on-Washington Movement, which Philip Randolph presents as a synthesis of negotiation, boycott, publicity, political pressure, economic organization, and deliberate non-violent action.

Two proposals are notable for their absence in this presentation of hopeful procedures. The first is that of any threat of violence. And Charles H. Wesley points out that the most unsuccessful of all strategies used by Negroes in the past is that of insurrection and violent seizures of power. The other suggestion strikingly absent is that apparently not one of these writers expects the Christian Church to be of any particular value to them in this day of struggle. And here is food for thought—and reason for repentance.

The most disconcerting note in this miscellany is the publisher's introduction, by W. T. Couch, of the University of North Carolina, who intrudes what appears to this reviewer to be a wholly irrelevant criticism of the rest of the book, in order to defend his particular version of white superiority and to charge that "the Negro's condition is produced by inferiority," which can be remedied only when the Negro ceases to "be so much concerned over the label 'equal' " and concentrates all his energies on being better than the white man. As a consistent corollary he defends segregation and legal proscription of intermarriage. He confuses the issue miserably by implying that one must hold this position or swing completely to a cultural relativism which rejects all objective moral criteria!

Despite the fact that the book is repetitious and lacks any apparent design, it makes an unmistakably unified impression. It is that the Negro in America is determined to complete his emancipation and is certain that the long swing of events is in his favor.

WALTER W. SIKES.

Anti-Semitism

Must Men Hate? By Sigmund Livingston. Harper & Brothers, New York. 344 pp. $2.50.

It is impossible to praise this book too highly. For one thing, it is such a complete job! It undertakes to present a survey of the mythology of anti-Semitism, and to answer point by point the great variety of libels and slanders, canards and hoaxes, silly and momentous charges of one kind and another, which have grown up, like foul weeds in a garden, through centuries of prejudice and persecution directed against the Jews.

Mr. Livingston begins by showing how anti-Semitism is unconsciously sown in the minds of little children by invidious references to Jews as a contemptuous or merely "different" people. Certain literature also plays havoc with the growing mind. Then come the great historic libels—the ritual blood accusation, the Protocols of Zion, the Talmud charges, the Benjamin Franklin forgery, the Dreyfus Case, the Bolshevist lie, and of course the "Jews killed Jesus" myth—all of which are set forth in these pages and answered with scrupulous detail. A third chapter deals with the riff-raff of common talk about Jews, which sprouts like "seeds scattered on plowed soil." What this may come to has its dreadful illustration in Nazi Germany, where anti-Semitism established a government and sustained a political and military regime through years of incalculable disaster. In the last half of his book, the author turns to the positive side and tells us what the Jews have contributed to America and to our whole western civilization. This leads in conclusion to a consideration of Judaism and Christianity, and of mass hatreds in general, and what can be done about an evil which threatens to devour us all.

Yes, Mr. Livingston has done a fine job. His great array of material, his skilful massing of his facts and arguments, his exemplary spirit, all are beyond praise, and combine to make this book the best treatise now available on the subject. Yet is the work a tragedy, from at least two points of view.

First, there is the tragedy that such a book has to be written. Think of a civilization which has not only tolerated but deliberately cultivated this miserable prejudice against a great and innocent people! In the light of the atomic bomb and its threat to our world, we may well ask ourselves if such a civilization, after all, is worth saving.

Secondly, there is the tragedy of what seems to be the naive assumption of the author that such material as he has so painstakingly gathered will make an impression upon the prejudiced mind. Is it not the very essence of prejudice that it is not susceptible to argument? How many persons, now hateful of the Jews, will read this book and be persuaded of his offense? No, the cure of anti-Semitism is not so easy. Like cancer, this scourge baffles alike our knowledge and our devotion.

None the less, we must, as in the case of cancer, keep up our fight against it. Mr. Livingston shows the way. To him be praise and honor.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

BOOKS with the SPIRIT of FELLOWSHIP for

HOLIDAY READING

Peace Is the Victory **$1.50**

A symposium by 13 Christian pacifists on the steps we must take to secure lasting peace. A new printing from Harper's plates.

Living Abundantly **$2.50**

Kirby Page's latest book of devotional readings, based on the lives of religious pioneers, past and present. Over 500 pages.

With the Master **$1.00**

Philippe Vernier's illuminating and inspiring meditations on selected passages of Scripture, translated by Edith L. Pierce.

The Constant Fire **$2.00**

Allan Knight Chalmers' newest book, presenting a vibrantly Christian message of great personal and social importance.

Humiliation with Honor **$1.00**

Vera Brittain's letters to her son, written during the war, carry a challenge to every Christian who is concerned about war's evils.

The Seamless Robe **$2.00**

Sarah Cleghorn's delightful and unique interpretation of "the religion of loving kindness" as applied to the problems of daily life.

Erasing the Color Line . . . . . **.25**

George Houser's new booklet reporting cases of non-violent direct action in attacking race discrimination in public places, 64 pp.

The Perennial Philosophy **$3.00**

Aldous Huxley's newest book, in which he draws upon the wisdom of the ages in order to find the common denominator of a faith for today. An anthology of the findings of the saints and sages.

THERE IS A SPIRIT: The Nayler Sonnets

By Kenneth E. Boulding

A brilliant sonnet sequence based on the last words of James Nayler, one of England's most powerful preachers and a leader of the Society of Friends. Twenty-six sonnets expressing the essence of Christianity. Hand-set type.

Cloth, 75¢ — Paper, 60¢; in lots of 10 or more, 50¢

Don't Forget — F.O.R. Christmas Cards

A beautiful, dignified greeting built around a sonnet especially written for this purpose by Kenneth Boulding, author of the famous Nayler Sonnets. Send 3¢ stamp for sample. Proceeds, as usual, go to the War Victims Fund of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. In two forms:

FOLDER, with envelopes
Printed in 2 colors
18 for $1 — 100 for $5

CARD, without envelopes
To mail as a postcard
25 for $1 — 100 for $3.50

Cost of FELLOWSHIP Increased

Sharply rising costs of printing and handling FELLOWSHIP have made it necessary to increase the subscription price, for members and non-members, beginning Jan. 1, to..... **$2.00** A YEAR

However, our special gift offer holds good until Jan. 1. Send your orders now. We send announcement cards. Each..... **$1.00**

LAST CHANCE TO STOP

CONSCRIPTION

What YOU do in your own community in the next few weeks may tip the balance. Educate public opinion—get these leaflets in circulation!

The Atom Bomb and a Peacetime Draft

Flyer showing how the atomic bomb makes official pleas for a peacetime draft absurd. 50 for 25¢—250 for $1.00—1,000 for $3.50.

If It's Compulsory, It's Conscription!

Leaflet answering claims that "universal training" is not conscription. From Oct. FELLOWSHIP. 12 for 25¢ — 100 for $1.50 — 1,000 for $10.

End the Draft Now!

Detailed answers to the militarists' propaganda. Help spread these facts. 50 for 25¢ — 250 for $1.00 — 1,000 for $3.50.

International Abolition of Conscription

Plea for action to abolish conscription by international agreement; text of Martin bill. 12 for 25¢ — 100 for $1.50 — 1,000 for $12.

Who Wants Peacetime Conscription?

Comparison of Hitler's conscription speeches with those of U. S. leaders, and answers. 12 for 25¢ — 100 for $1.50 — 1,000 for $12.

The Case Against Compulsory Peacetime Military Training

Revelation of efforts of Army and Navy officers to keep big-pay jobs in peacetime. 10¢ each — 15 for $1.00 — 100 for $5.00.

Pearl Harbor and Preparedness

Swomley's article in Nov. FELLOWSHIP, debunking military "preparedness" as security. 50 for 25¢ — 250 for $1.00 — 1,000 for $3.50.

Conscription After the War?

64-page Forerunners Studybook by Harrop and Ruth Freeman; for study and discussion. 25¢ each — 20% discount on orders of 10 or more.

Sourcebook on Peacetime Conscription

A handy encyclopedia of useful information about peacetime conscription. Know the facts! 25¢ each, regardless of quantity.

●

ATOMIC BOMB

The Atomic Bomb and the American Dream

A. J. Muste's article in Oct. FELLOWSHIP. 35¢ per dozen — $2.00 per 100 — $15 per 1,000.

The Atomic Bomb: What Are We Going to Do with It?

Flyer summarizing Muste's article above. 100 for 35¢ — 1,000 for $3.00.

CASH WITH ORDER EXPEDITES SERVICE AND REDUCES EXPENSE—THANK YOU!

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION • 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.